arXiv:math/0510225v1 [math.AP] 11 Oct 2005

Energy concentration and brittle crack propagation

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to fill the gap between the classical treatment of brittle fracture mechanics and the new idea of considering the crack evolution as a free discontinuity problem. Griffith and Irwin criterions of crack propagation are studied and transformed in order to be no longer dependent on any prescription of the geometry of the crack during its evolution. The inequality contained in theorem 6.1. represents the link between generalized Irwin and Griffith criterions of brittle crack propagation. The physical meaning of this inequality is explained in the last section.

1 Introduction **2**

2 Preliminaries and notations **3**

3 Statics of a fractured body **5**
3.1 Functional assumptions 5
3.2 Dirichlet-to Neumann map 6

4 Kinematics of crack propagation **8**

5 Crack propagation criterions **11**

6 Energy concentration and crack propagation **16**

7 Proof of theorem 6.1. **18**

8 Final considerations **23**

Note to the reader

This is a paper which has been submitted for publication in a well-known journal in 1997. The referee did not want to accept the paper unless substantial modifications are made. In my opinion the suggested modifications (excepting ortographic, typographical or minor mathematical ones) were against the philosophy of the paper, which is: brittle fracture propagation is a geometrical evolution problem, therefore geometrical treatment is highly significant, both from mechanical and mathematical point of view.

As this (eventually unpublished) paper circulated in manuscript, I think it is safe to depose it in the arXiv, for further reference and comparison with other works in this narrow domain.

No modifications were made to the original file, excepting some preprint references in the bibliography, which were published since.

1 Introduction

Brittle fracture mechanics studies the evolution of the cracks in elastic bodies. Since the medium under consideration is supposed to remain elastic, the problem of brittle crack propagation concerns the evolution of the geometric support of the crack. We are facing here a problem placed in between geometry and mechanics.

The field of research in brittle fracture mechanics has appeared in 1920 with Griffith's paper [G]. Among the basic references in this field we find: Irwin [I], Eshelby [Es], Gurtin [Gu1], [Gu2].

Typically for classical fracture mechanics is that the geometrical nature of brittle crack evolution problem is obscured by the assumption of prescribed geometry of the crack. There are very few papers which do not make this assumption; as an example we cite here Ohtsuka [Oht1—4] and Stumpf & Le [StLe].

In the last decade a new current of ideas has emerged, starting with the article of Mumford & Shah [MS], submitted for publication in 1986. It is the first time, to our knowledge, when the crack itself is considered as the unknown of the problem of brittle crack appearance. Some new mathematical results of De Giorgi and Ambrosio ([DGA], [A1], [A2]) in the field of geometric measure theory, set the energetic model of brittle crack appearance proposed by Mumford and Shah in the functional space **SBV**, of special functions with bounded variation.

The strange unknown of the problem — the crack — is replaced by a more familiar one: the displacement field of the cracked body. This field is allowed to be discontinuous, being a special function with bounded variation. Recent papers study the space **SBD** of special functions with bounded deformation, as Bellettini, Coscia & Dal Maso [BCDM] and Ambrosio, Coscia & Dal Maso [ACDM], naturally associated with the expression of free energy potential of an elastic body suffering small deformations.

It is now clear that a promising point of view concerning crack evolution is to consider it as a free discontinuity problem. The purpose of this paper is

to fill the gap between the classical treatment of brittle fracture mechanics and these new ideas. We present here some of the results obtained in [Bu]. The Griffith and Irwin criterions of crack propagation are studied and transformed in order to be no longer dependent on any prescription of the geometry of the crack during its evolution.

The content of the paper is described further. In the section "Preliminaries and notations" some basic constitutive assumptions are made. The following section, "Statics of a fractured body", contains a mathematical treatment of the equilibrium of an elastic cracked body in a functional setting compatible with the space **SBV**. This section contains also a brief description of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map of a cracked body. For more information about this notion we send the reader to [C], [SU1,2].

The section "Kinematics of crack propagation" starts with the introduction of a set of reasonably smooth endomorphisms of Ω, the reference configuration of the body, useful in the sequel. The notion of smooth crack propagation is introduced, in various forms (definitions 4.1. to 4.3.). A smooth crack propagation can be seen as a curve of endomorphisms of Ω, namely $t \mapsto \phi_t$. The initial crack K, which is a surface with boundary in Ω, becomes at the moment t the actual crack $K_t = \phi_t(K)$. We mention that in [StLe] variations of the crack by diffeomorphisms are considered; also, in [Oht1—4], a curve of diffeomorphisms $t \mapsto \phi_t$ is associated to a curve of cracks $t \mapsto K_t$.

In the section "Crack propagation criterions" Griffith and Irwin criterions of brittle crack propagation are reformulated for smooth crack propagation. This is accomplished by proposition 5.1., definitions 5.1. (generalized Rice's J integral) and 5.2 (concentration coefficients of the elastic energy).

The section "Energy concentration and crack propagation" begins with the introduction of the measure $\mid K2 \mid (\mathbf{u})$ (definition 6.1.) associated to a field $\mathbf{u}$ of displacements. This measure describes the distribution in the body of the energy release rate due to the crack propagation. In definition 6.2. is introduced, for the same arbitrary field of displacements $\mathbf{u}$, the upper energy concentration coefficient as a measure, namely $CM^+(\mathbf{u})$. The main result of the paper is theorem 6.1., which describes the relations between these two measures.

A byproduct of the proof of theorem 6.1., with important physical significance, is presented in the last section.

2 Preliminaries and notations

Let $\Omega \subset R^n$ represent the reference configuration of an elastic body. The space dimension n equals 2 or 3 and Ω is an open bounded set with piecewise smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. The volume density of the free energy is a function $w = w(\nabla\mathbf{u})$. $\mathbf{u}$ denotes the displacement of the body from the reference configuration. We suppose that the function w depends only on $\epsilon(\mathbf{u})$, the symmetric part of $\nabla\mathbf{u}$. In this paper we work with a quadratic expression of w:

$$w(\nabla\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u} : \nabla\mathbf{u} \quad . \tag{1}$$

The tensor $\mathbf{C}$ has the symmetries:

$$C_{ijkl} \;=\; C_{jikl} \;=\; C_{klij} \qquad . \tag{2}$$

Most of the facts herein are true whenever w is a convex, C^2 function, satisfying the following growth condition: there are two positive constants c, C such that

$$\forall E \in R^{n\times n}\ ,\ c\ \mid E^{sym}\mid^2 \leq\ w(E)\ \leq C\mid E\mid^2 \qquad \left(E^{sym} := \frac{1}{2}(E+E^T)\right)\quad . \tag{3}$$

We will restrict however our attention to the case when the energy function w satisfies (3), has the form (1) and $\mathbf{C}$ satisfies (2).

The first Piola-Kirchoff stress tensor is defined by:

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) = \frac{dw}{dA_{ij}}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \qquad .$$

The body evolves in a quasi-static manner, in the absence of volume forces, so at any moment the stress tensor σ is divergence free.

The Hausdorff k-dimensional measure is denoted by $\mathcal{H}^k$. $\mathcal{H}^2$ is the area measure and $\mathcal{H}^1$ is the length measure. In order to simplify the denominations we shall often call $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ the area measure. The volume measure is $\mathcal{H}^n = \mathcal{L}^n$, the Lebesgue measure.

Any crack in the body is seen as a "crack set" (see Ball [Ba]): a closed countably rectifiable set $K \subset \overline{\Omega}$ with finite area. Any smooth hyper-surface with bounded mean curvature and with boundary in $\overline{\Omega}$ is called a "smooth crack set". A smooth crack set it is therefore a crack set which carries the geometric structure of a manifold with boundary. The boundary of the smooth crack set K, denoted by ∂K, represents the edge of the smooth crack set. The edge ∂K is a $n-2$ piecewise smooth surface without boundary.

In this paper we work with smooth crack sets K with the property:

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\left(K \cap \partial\Omega\right) \;=\; 0 \quad .$$

This assumption has the following meaning: the intersection of the smooth crack set with the exterior boundary of the body $\partial\Omega$ is at most a reunion of curves.

The space $\mathbf{SBV}(\Omega, R^n)$ of special functions with bounded variation was introduced by De Giorgi and Ambrosio in the study of a class of free discontinuity problems ([DGA], [A1], [A2]). For any function $\mathbf{u} \in L^1(\Omega, R^n)$ let us denote by $D\mathbf{u}$ the distributional derivative of $\mathbf{u}$ seen as a vector measure. The variation of $D\mathbf{u}$ is a scalar measure defined like this: for any Borel measurable subset B of Ω the variation of $D\mathbf{u}$ over B is

$$\mid D\mathbf{u}\mid(B) \;=\; sup\ \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\mid D\mathbf{u}(A_i)\mid\ :\ \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \subset B\ ,\ A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset\ \ \forall i \neq j\right\}\quad .$$

The Lebesgue set of $\mathbf{u}$ is the set of points where $\mathbf{u}$ has approximate limit. The complementary set is a $\mathcal{L}^n$ negligible set denoted by $\mathbf{S_u}$.

The space $\mathbf{SBV}(\Omega, R^n)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{SBV}(\Omega, R^n) \;=\; \left\{\mathbf{u} \in L^1(\Omega, R^n):\ \mid D\mathbf{u}\mid(\Omega) < +\infty\ ,\ \mid D^s\mathbf{u}\mid(\Omega \setminus \mathbf{S_u}) = 0\right\}\ .$$

Let us define the following Sobolev space associated to the crack set K (see [ABF]):

$$W^{1,2}_K \;=\; \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{SBV}(\Omega, R^n) : \int_\Omega \mid \nabla \mathbf{u} \mid^2 \; \mathrm{d}x + \int_K [\mathbf{u}]^2 \; \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} < +\infty \;,\; \mid D^s \mathbf{u} \mid \ll \mathcal{H}^{n-1}_{\mid_K} \right\} .$$

It has been proved in [DGCL] the following equality:

$$W^{1,2}_K(\Omega, R^n) \cap L^\infty(\Omega, R^n) = W^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus K, R^n) \cap L^\infty(\Omega, R^n) \quad .$$

We shall need further a norm with physical dimension on the Sobolev space

$$W^{p,2,\infty}(\Omega, R^n) = W^{p,2}(\Omega, R^n) \cap L^\infty(\Omega, R^n) \quad .$$

Consider therefore λ as an unit of length. We take the following norm on $W^{p,2}(\Omega, R^n)$:

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{p,2} = \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \;+\; \lambda \, \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \;+\; ... \;+\; \lambda^p \, \|\nabla^p \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \quad .$$

This norm induces on $W^{p,2,\infty}(\Omega, R^n)$ the norm

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{p,2,\infty} = \; max(vol(\Omega) \; \|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{u}\|_{p,2}) \quad ,$$

where $vol(\Omega)$ is the volume of Ω measured with the unit λ^n.

3 Statics of a fractured body

3.1 Functional assumptions

Let us consider an elastic body Ω with a smooth crack set K. The displacement $\mathbf{u}^0 \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega, R^n) \cap L^\infty(\partial\Omega, R^n)$ is imposed on the exterior boundary $\partial\Omega$.

Therefore the equilibrium displacement $\mathbf{u}$ is a special function with bounded variation. ¿From the Calderon & Zygmund [CZ] decomposition theorem we obtain the following expression of $D\mathbf{u}$, the distributional derivative of $\mathbf{u}$ seen as a measure:

$$D\mathbf{u} \;=\; \nabla \mathbf{u}(x) \; \mathrm{d}x \;+\; [\mathbf{u}] \otimes \mathbf{n} \; \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_{\mid_K} \quad .$$

We deduce from here the Stokes formula:

$$\langle D\mathbf{u}, \phi \rangle = \int_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \phi \; \mathrm{d}x + \int_K [\mathbf{u}] \otimes \mathbf{n} \cdot \phi \; \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \quad \forall \phi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega, R^{n \times n}) \quad . \quad (4)$$

This formula is the mathematical expression of the fact that are no concentrated forces on the edge of the crack.

Any element of $W^{1,2}_K$, compatible with the boundary condition, is called an admissible displacement. The family of admissible stresses will be defined in the sequel.

The jump of a field σ across K is $[\sigma] = \sigma^+ - \sigma^-$. Del Piero considers in [DP] the following set of admissible stresses for a fractured media:

$$Y(\Omega) = \left\{\sigma = \sigma^T \in L^2(\Omega, R^{n\times n}) : div\sigma = 0\right\} \quad .$$

He proves that if $\sigma \in Y(\Omega)$ then $\sigma^+\mathbf{n} = \sigma^-\mathbf{n}$. This fact allows us to use the notation $\sigma\mathbf{n}$ without confusion.

We connect further the definition of an admissible displacement field with the definition of an admissible stress field.

Definition 3.1.1. *Let $\mathbf{u}^0 \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega, R^n) \cap L^\infty(\partial\Omega, R^n)$ represent an imposed displacement on the exterior boundary of the body Ω and let K be a crack set in Ω. The set of admissible displacements with respect to $\mathbf{u}^0$ and K is*

$$W_K^{1,2,\infty}(\mathbf{u}^0) \;=\; \left\{\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus K, R^n) \cap L^\infty(\Omega, R^n) \;:\; \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \;\right\} \qquad (5)$$

and the set of admissible stresses with respect to K is

$$Y_K(\Omega) = \left\{\sigma = \sigma^T \in L^2(\Omega, R^{n\times n}) : div\sigma = 0 \;,\; \sigma\mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } K\right\} \quad . \qquad (6)$$

On the crack set the body is force free, i.e. $\sigma^{+,-}\mathbf{n} = 0$ on K, where $\mathbf{n}$ is the field of normals on K and σ^+, σ^- are the traces of σ on the sides of K. The sign convention is taken such that the field of normals to K, $\mathbf{n}$, points to the "+" side of K. There are no concentrated forces on the edge of the crack.

3.2 Dirichlet-to Neumann map

The equilibrium displacement of the body, when the boundary displacement $\mathbf{u}^0$ is imposed, is solution of the problem:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} div\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u}) \;=\; 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus K \\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u})^+\mathbf{n} \;=\; \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u})^-\mathbf{n} \;=\; 0 & \text{on } K \\ \mathbf{u} \;=\; \mathbf{u}^0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad . \end{array}\right. \qquad (7)$$

The equilibrium displacement $\mathbf{u}$ minimizes the functional

$$E(\mathbf{v}) \;=\; \int_\Omega w(\nabla\mathbf{v})\ \mathrm{d}x$$

defined over all $\mathbf{v} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus K, R^n)$, $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}^0$ on $\partial\Omega$. The solution of the minimization problem is unique to an arbitrary piecewise rigid displacement equal to 0 on $\partial\Omega$. Also, $\mathbf{u}$ is smooth and essentially bounded.

$Y_K(\Omega)$ is a subset of $Y(\Omega)$; in the definition the quantity $\sigma\mathbf{n}$ does not depend on the choice of $\mathbf{n}$.

The polar of the convex functional $W(\epsilon) = \int_\Omega w(\epsilon)\ \mathrm{d}x$ is (see Moreau [M]):

$$W^*(\sigma) = \sup\left\{\langle\sigma, \epsilon\rangle - W(\epsilon) : \epsilon \in L^2(\Omega, R^{n\times n}_{sym})\right\} \quad .$$

For any admissible stress $\sigma \in Y_K(\Omega)$ and for any minimizer $\mathbf{u}$ of the functional E over the class of admissible displacements, the following inequality is true:

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} (\sigma\mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u}_0 \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} - \ W^*(\sigma) \leq E(\mathbf{u}) \quad . \tag{8}$$

The inequality becomes an equality if and only if $\sigma = \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u})$.

For a given crack set K the Dirichlet-to-Neumann (or the response) map associated to the domain Ω with the crack K inside can be defined. This map is defined in the following way: let $\mathbf{u}^0$ be given on the boundary of Ω. The solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} div\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u}) \ = \ 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus K \\ \mathbf{u} \ = \ \mathbf{u}^0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u})\mathbf{n} \ = \ 0 & \text{on (both sides of) } K \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

will be denoted by $\mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0)$. This solution is uniquely determined to a rigid displacement equal to 0 on $\partial\Omega$ hence $\sigma(K, \mathbf{u}^0)$ is unique.

It is obvious that $\mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0)$ is also solution of the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} div\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u}) \ = \ 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus K \\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u})\mathbf{n} \ = \ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0))\mathbf{n} & \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u})\mathbf{n} \ = \ 0 & \text{on (both sides of) } K \quad . \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Therefore the function $\mathbf{u}^0 \mapsto \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0))\cdot\mathbf{n}$ maps naturally a Dirichlet boundary condition to a Neumann boundary condition. The Dirichlet-to-Neumann map is the linear application:

$$\mathbf{T}(K) : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \to H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \quad ,$$

$$\langle \mathbf{T}(K)\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{v}^0 \rangle \ = \ \int_{\partial\Omega} \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0))\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \quad . \tag{11}$$

Here $\langle \ , \ \rangle$ means the duality product.The Dirichlet-to-Neumann map is continuous due to the well known continuous dependence of the solutions of the problems (9) and (10) with respect to boundary data. The symmetries of the elasticity tensor $\mathbf{C}$ make this map self adjoint.

If $\mathbf{u}^0$ is essentially bounded then the solution of the problem (unique to a rigid displacement equal to 0 on $\partial\Omega$)

$$minimize \int_\Omega w(\nabla\mathbf{u}) \ dx \ over \ all \ \mathbf{u} \in W_K^{1,2,\infty}(\mathbf{u}^0)$$

is $\mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0)$, hence

$$\frac{1}{2} \ \langle \mathbf{T}(K)\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{u}^0 \rangle \ = \ min \ \left\{ \int_\Omega w(\nabla\mathbf{u}) \ \mathrm{d}x : \mathbf{u} \in W_K^{1,2,\infty}(\mathbf{u}^0) \right\} \quad .$$

4 Kinematics of crack propagation

Let us consider a hyper-elastic body with the reference configuration Ω. At the moment $t = 0$ in the body there is the crack set K. The evolution of the crack is a curve $t \mapsto K_t$ such that $K_0 = K$ and for any $t < t'$ $K_t \subset K_{t'}$.

We are searching for an easy way to describe the evolution of the crack set. If the dimension of the space is $n = 2$ then an obvious way to describe the evolution of the crack set is to consider only the evolution of the edge of K,i.e. ∂K, which is formed by a finite number of points. In the general case $n = 3$ this corresponds to the evolution $t \mapsto \partial K_t$ where ∂K_t is a curve. Because the evolution of a surface in the three-dimensional space is conceptually simpler than the evolution of a curve, the before mentioned choice of modeling the crack propagation does not simplify our problem. We prefer instead to think at the crack set K_t as a deformation of the initial crack set K by a diffeomorphism $\phi_t : \Omega \to \Omega$. We replace therefore the curve $t \mapsto K_t$ with the curve $t \mapsto \phi_t$, satisfying the condition $\phi_t(K) = K_t$. (However, not any curve $t \mapsto K_t$ has an associated curve $t \mapsto \phi_t$. As a counterexample we may think at cracks which after a time develop new branches.)

The curve $t \mapsto \phi_t$ lies in a set of diffeomorphisms.

Let us consider the following family of diffeomorphisms:

$$M_c \;=\; \big\{\phi \in C^\infty(\Omega,\Omega) \cap W^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega, R^n) : \tag{12}$$

$$\phi \text{ is a diffeomorphism and } supp\ (\phi - 1_\Omega) \subset \Omega \ \}$$

The set M_c can be conveniently completed to a topological group, which has a geometrical structure.

We consider, inspired from Ebin & Marsden [EbM], the closure of the set M_c in the $W^{s,2,\infty}$ topology:

$$D_c^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega) \;=\; Cl^{W^{s,2,\infty}}\ M_c \ , \tag{13}$$

where s is chosen to be greater than a critical value.

The tangent space at $D^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega)$ in 1_Ω is denoted by $T_{1_\Omega}D^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega)$ and it is equal to

$$W_0^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega, R^n) \;=\; Cl^{W^{s,2,\infty}}\ \big\{\eta \in C^\infty(\Omega, R^n) \cap W^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega, R^n) :\ supp\ \eta \subset \Omega\big\}\ .$$

This tangent space may be endowed with the norm $\| \ \|_{1_\Omega} \;=\; \| \ \|_{W^{s,2,\infty}}$. The tangent space at ϕ and the corresponding norm can be obtained from the tangent space and norm at the identity by right multiplication with ϕ.

The existence of the exponential map is proven in [EbM], theorem 3.1. for the group of $W^{s,2}$ diffeomorphisms of M, where M is a compact manifold without boundary. The group defined at (13) can be seen as a group of diffeomorphisms of a compact manifold equal to identity near a point of the manifold. The results of Ebin & Marsden are still true in this case. In theorem 3.4. from the same article is proven that any continuous time dependent vector field can be integrated. We give the exact statements of these theorems, adapted to our case. We do not give the proof, since it requires the same techniques as the ones employed in the article mentioned before:

Theorem 4.1. *Let Ω be an open bounded set in R^n with piecewise smooth boundary and s a number satisfying*

$$s \geq \frac{n}{2} + 2 \quad .$$

Let $\eta \in W_0^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega, R^n)$ be a vector field on Ω, vanishing near $\partial\Omega$. Then the one parameter flow generated by η is a C^1 one parameter subgroup of $D_c^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega)$.

Let $t \mapsto \eta_t \in W_0^{s,2}(\Omega, R^n)$ be a continuous time dependent vector field on Ω. Then the problem:

$$\eta_t = \dot{\phi}_t.\phi_t^{-1} \quad , \phi_0 = 1_\Omega$$

has a solution, unique, which is a C^1 curve in $D_c^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega)$.

We shall define further the notion of smooth crack propagation curve.

Definition 4.1. *Let us consider $s \geq \frac{n}{2} + 2$. An s-smooth crack propagation curve is a C^1 curve*

$$t \in [0,T] \mapsto \phi_t \in D_c^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega) \quad ,$$

satisfying the following properties:

- *$\phi_0 = 1_\Omega$, the identity map of Ω,*
- *$\phi_t(K) \subset \phi_{t'}(K)$ for any $0 \leq t < t' \leq T$.*

For any smooth crack propagation curve we associate the curve $t \mapsto K_t = \phi_t(K)$. The last curve has the obvious property that for any $t > 0$ the crack set K_t can be continuously deformed into K. In other words, K_t and K are topologically the same. We restrict our attention to this kind of evolution of the initial crack set. In this approach the initial crack K may be as complex as we wish, but this complexity remains the same during its evolution.

There are infinitely many smooth crack propagation curves $t \mapsto \phi_t$ with the same associated function $t \mapsto K_t$.

Definition 4.2. *Let $t \in [0,T] \mapsto \mathbf{u}^0(t) \in C(\partial\Omega, R^n)$ be a C^1 curve of imposed displacements on the exterior boundary of the body. An admissible fracture curve is any C^1 function*

$$t \in [0,T] \mapsto (\mathbf{u}_t^*, \phi_t) \in W_K^{1,2} \times D_c^{2,p,\infty}(\Omega) \quad ,$$

satisfying the following items:

- *for any $t \in [0,T]$ $\mathbf{u}_t^* = \mathbf{u}^0(t)$ on $\partial\Omega$,*
- *$t \mapsto \phi_t$ is a s-smooth crack propagation curve.*

Let us denote $\mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{u}_t^*.\phi_t^{-1}$. Because for any t ϕ_t equals the identity map near the boundary of Ω, we deduce that $\mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{u}^0(t)$ on $\partial\Omega$. Remark also that the application $\mathbf{u}^* \mapsto \mathbf{u}^*.\phi^{-1}$, where $\phi \in D_c^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega)$, maps $W_K^{1,2}$ onto $W_{\phi(K)}^{1,2}$, therefore $\mathbf{u}_t$ is an admissible displacement of the body Ω with the crack set $\phi_t(K)$.

Definition 4.3. *A balanced fracture curve is an admissible fracture curve $t \mapsto (\mathbf{u}_t^*, \phi_t)$ such that at any moment $t \geq 0$ the displacement $\mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{u}_t^*.\phi_t^{-1}$ is a solution of the problem*

$$min \left\{ \int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \, \mathrm{d}x : \mathbf{u} \in W^{1,2,\infty}_{\phi_t(K)}(\mathbf{u}^0(t)) \right\} \quad .$$

For any smooth crack propagation curve there is an associated balanced fracture curve, unique to rigid displacements.

We are concerned now with the evolution of the area of the crack set.

It is well-known (see [All]) that the variation of the area of the crack set $\phi_t(K)$ is

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\phi_t(K)) \; = \; \int_{\phi_t(K)} div_s \eta_t \; \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \quad ,$$

where div_s is the tangential divergence with respect to the surface $\phi_t(K)$. If we denote by $\mathbf{n}$ the field of normals to this surface, the expression of the tangential derivative div_s is:

$$div_s \eta \; = \; \eta_{i,i} \; - \; \eta_{i,j}\mathbf{n}_i\mathbf{n}_j \quad .$$

For a smooth crack propagation curve $t \mapsto \phi_t$ the condition that the crack grows implies that for any $t \geq 0$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \eta_t \cdot \mathbf{n} \; = 0 & \text{on } \phi_t(K) \\ \int_{\phi_t(K)} div_s \eta_t \; \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \; \geq 0 & \end{array} \right. \tag{14}$$

It will be useful to define a perimeter measure of the edge of the crack. For this let us consider a crack set K. The perimeter of ∂K can be defined, with the help of a flux-divergence formula, like this:

$$\mathcal{P}(\partial K) \; = \; sup \left\{ \int_K div_s \eta \; \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \; ; \eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, R^n) \; , \mid \eta \mid \leq 1 \; , \; \eta \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } K \right\} \quad .$$

The perimeter of ∂K as a measure is defined first as an additive function over the set of open subsets B of Ω:

$$\mathcal{P}(\partial K)(B) \; = \; sup \left\{ \int_K div_s \eta \; \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \; ; \eta \in C_0^\infty(B, R^n) \; , \mid \eta \mid \leq 1 \; , \; \eta \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } K \right\} \tag{15}$$

This function generates a measure which is the perimeter of ∂K as a measure.

5 Crack propagation criterions

In order to select one or more crack propagation curves among all admissible ones one needs a criterion of brittle crack propagation. There are several such criterions. We shall discuss about two of them, in principle different.

The Griffith criterion asserts that during the crack propagation the energy release rate due only to the crack evolution has to be greater than a critical quantity. This criterion may take different mathematical forms. Whatever this form may be, this criterion is formulated in terms of a critical speed.

The Irwin type criterion asserts that during the crack propagation some intensity (or concentration) factors have to be greater than a critical value. The original Irwin criterion is formulated in terms of stress intensity factors. However, it is straightforward that it can be reformulated by using the elastic energy concentration on the edge of the crack. We shall refer to any crack propagation criterion using energy concentration factors (whatever they mean) as to the Irwin criterion.

The goal of this section is to give precise mathematical expressions to the Griffith and Irwin criterions for the class of smooth crack propagation curves.

We shall use in the sequel the notation

$$\mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)) \ = \ \mathbf{u}_t \ = \ \mathbf{u}(\phi_t(K), \mathbf{u}^0(t))$$

since the initial crack K is given. The stress field associated to this displacement is $\sigma_t = \sigma(\nabla \mathbf{u}_t)$.

The power communicated by the universe to the body at the moment t has the expression

$$P(t) \ = \ \int_{\partial\Omega} \sigma_t \mathbf{n} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{u}}_t^0 \ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \quad .$$

The Griffith criterion of brittle fracture propagation is the following:

A balanced fracture curve $t \mapsto (\mathbf{u}_t^*, \phi_t)$ satisfies the Griffith criterion if at any moment $t \geq 0$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t))) \ \mathrm{d}x \ + \ G\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\phi_t(K)) \right\} \leq P(t) \quad . \tag{16}$$

G is a material constant, named the constant of Griffith.

The energy release rate due only to the propagation of the crack has the well-known expression:

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \ = \ P(t) \ - \ \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t))) \ \mathrm{d}x \quad . \tag{17}$$

The inequality (16) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \ \geq \ G \ \frac{d}{dt} \ \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\phi_t(K)) \quad .$$

This criterion seems hard to work with it. The following proposition will lead us to an easier version of (16).

Proposition 5.1. *Let $t \mapsto \phi_t$ be a smooth crack propagation curve, $\eta_t = \dot{\phi}_t.\phi_t^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{u}^0 \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$. Then for all $t \geq 0$ the following inequality is true :*

$$\langle \frac{d}{dt}\left[\mathbf{T}(\phi_t)\right]\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{u}^0\rangle \ \leq \tag{18}$$

$$\leq \int_\Omega \left\{ \left[\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0) : \nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0)\right] div\ \eta_t \ - 2\left[\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0)\right]_{ij}\left[\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0)\right]_{ik}\left[\nabla\eta_t\right]_{kj}\right\} \ \mathrm{d}x \ .$$

Proof: The smooth crack propagation curve ϕ_t is associated to the balanced fracture curve $(\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0).\phi_t, \phi_t)$. Let us choose a $t \geq 0$ and keep it fixed. We define now, for any $s \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{u}_{t,s} = \mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0).\phi_t.\phi_{t+s}^{-1} \ .$$

It is obvious that for all $s \geq 0$ $\mathbf{S}\mathbf{u}_{t,s} \subset \phi_{t+s}(K)$, hence

$$\forall s \geq 0 \ , \ \langle \mathbf{T}(\phi_{t+s})\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{u}^0\rangle \leq \int_\Omega \mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,s} : \nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,s} \ \mathrm{d}x \ .$$

For $s = 0$ $\mathbf{u}_{t,0} = \mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0)$, so

$$\langle \mathbf{T}(\phi_t)\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{u}^0\rangle \ = \ \int_\Omega \mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,0} : \nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,0} \ \mathrm{d}x \ .$$

We deduce that

$$\langle \frac{d}{dt}\left[\mathbf{T}(\phi_t)\right]\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{u}^0\rangle = \frac{d}{ds}\langle \mathbf{T}(\phi_{t+s})\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{u}^0\rangle_{|_{s=0}} \leq \frac{d}{ds}\int_\Omega \mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,s} : \nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,s} \ \mathrm{d}x_{|_{s=0}} \ .$$

It remains to prove that

$$\int_\Omega \left\{ \left[\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0) : \nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0)\right] div\ \eta_t \ - 2\left[\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0)\right]_{ij}\left[\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi_t,\mathbf{u}^0)\right]_{ik}\left[\nabla\eta_t\right]_{kj}\right\} \ \mathrm{d}x \ =$$

$$= \ \frac{d}{ds}\int_\Omega \mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,s} : \nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,s} \ \mathrm{d}x_{|_{s=0}} \ .$$

The last equality results by direct calculation. It is sufficient to make in the integral

$$\int_\Omega \mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,s} : \nabla\mathbf{u}_{t,s} \ \mathrm{d}x$$

the change of variables $y = \phi_t.\phi_{t+s}^{-1}(x)$ and then to perform the calculation of the derivative. •

Definition 5.1. *The generalized Rice's J integral is the functional*

$$K2 \ : \ D_c^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega) \times T_{1_\Omega} D_c^{s,2,\infty}(\Omega) \times \left\{ H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \ \cap L^\infty(\partial\Omega)\right\} \ \rightarrow \ R \ ,$$

$$K2(\phi,\eta,\mathbf{u}^0) \;=\; \int_\Omega \Big\{ -\frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi,\mathbf{u}^0):\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi,\mathbf{u}^0)\right] div\ \eta + \tag{19}$$
$$+\left[\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi,\mathbf{u}^0)\right]_{ij}\left[\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi,\mathbf{u}^0)\right]_{ik}\left[\nabla\eta\right]_{kj}\Big\}\ \mathrm{d}x\ .$$

We shall explain why $K2$ is called "the generalized Rice's J integral" in the remark 5.2.. Before that we give an alternative expression of $K2$.

Let us simplify the notations:

$$\sigma=\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi,\mathbf{u}^0)\ \ ,\ \mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}(\phi,\mathbf{u}^0)\ \ ,\ w=\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{C}\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi,\mathbf{u}^0):\nabla\mathbf{u}(\phi,\mathbf{u}^0)\ \ .$$

If $\mathbf{u}$ is a C^2 function then the following equality makes sense:

$$w\,\eta_{i,i}-\sigma_{ij}\mathbf{u}_{i,k}\,\eta_{k,j}=\left[w\,\eta_i\ -\ \sigma_{lj}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\,\eta_k\right]_{,i}-\sigma_{km}\mathbf{u}_{k,mi}\,\eta_i+\sigma_{li}\mathbf{u}_{l,ki}\,\eta_k+\sigma_{li,i}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\,\eta_k\ .$$

The divergence of the field σ is equal to 0, hence

$$K2(\phi,\eta,\mathbf{u}^0)\ =\ -\int_\Omega\left[w\,\eta_i\ -\ \sigma_{li}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\,\eta_k\right]_{,i}\ \mathrm{d}x\ .$$

Let $\partial\phi(K)$ be the edge of the crack set $\phi(K)$. We define the tubular neighborhood of $\partial\phi(K)$ of radius r:

$$B_r=B_r(\partial\phi(K))=\cup_{x\in\partial\phi(K)}B(x,r)\ \ .$$

The field of normals over $\partial\ B_r(\partial\phi(K))$ will be denoted by ν, without specifying the parameter r.

The function

$$x\in\Omega\ \mapsto w\ div\eta(x)-\sigma_{li}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\,\eta_{k,i}\ (x)$$

is measurable, $\eta=0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\sigma\mathbf{n}=0$ on $\phi(K)$, therefore

$$K2(\phi,\eta,\mathbf{u}^0)=\lim_{r\to0}\left\{\int_{\partial B_r(\partial\phi(K))}\left\{-w\eta\cdot\nu\ +\sigma_{li}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\,\eta_k\,\nu_i\right\}\ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\right\}+\int_{\phi(K)}[w]\,\eta\cdot\mathbf{n}\ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\ .$$

If $\eta\cdot\mathbf{n}=0$ on $\phi(K)$ then

$$K2(\phi,\eta,\mathbf{u}^0)=\lim_{r\to0}\left\{\int_{\partial B_r(\partial\phi(K))}-\left\{w\eta\cdot\nu\ -\sigma_{li}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\,\eta_k\,\nu_i\right\}\ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\right\}\ \ . \tag{20}$$

Remark 5.1. In [Oht1—4] Ohtsuka generalizes the Rice's integral J. For a given, very smooth, curve of increasing crack sets $t\mapsto K_t$, he founds a vector field η_0 whose one-parameter flow ϕ_t has the property

$$K_t\ =\ \phi_t(K_0)\ \ .$$

He takes into consideration not only imposed displacements on the exterior boundary of the body but also imposed forces. The connection between his generalization and the functional $K2$ is the following:

$$GJ(K_t, \mathbf{u}^0) \;=\; K2(\phi_t, \eta_0, \mathbf{u}^0) \quad .$$

Ohtsuka proves that $GJ(K_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t))$ equals the energy release rate $\mathcal{E}(t)$. •

Remark 5.2. In the very particular case of one-dimensional crack propagation following a straight line Rice [R] expresses the energy release rate by an integral, named J. The expression of J is formally similar with the right member of (20) when η is taken equal to a constant vector (the speed of the crack edge) parallel with the crack.

The source of the notation $K2$ can be found in the particular case of a straight crack in the 2-dimensional configuration. Let us suppose that the body is a cylinder with section Ω and consider only anti-plane displacements:

$$\mathbf{u} : \Omega \times R \to R^3 \;, \quad \mathbf{u}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \;=\; (0, 0, u(x_1, x_2)) \quad .$$

In this case the integral J is proportional with the square of the stress intensity factor in mode III denoted by K_{III}. •

In the sequel we shall use the notation:

$$\mathbf{T}(\phi) \;=\; \mathbf{T}(\phi(K)) \quad .$$

The energy release rate $\mathcal{E}(t)$ has the following expression:

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \;=\; \langle \mathbf{T}\phi_t)\mathbf{u}^0(t), \dot{\mathbf{u}}^0(t)\rangle \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\,\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\langle \mathbf{T}\phi_t)\mathbf{u}^0(t), \mathbf{u}^0(t)\rangle\right\} \quad .$$

We use the fact that $\mathbf{T}(\phi)$ is self-adjoint for proving that

$$\langle \mathbf{T}\phi_t)\mathbf{u}^0(t), \dot{\mathbf{u}}^0(t)\rangle \;=\; \langle \mathbf{T}\phi_t)\dot{\mathbf{u}}^0(t), \mathbf{u}^0(t)\rangle \quad .$$

The last two relations show that the energy release rate has the expression:

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \;=\; -\,\frac{1}{2}\langle\, \frac{d}{dt}\left[\mathbf{T}(\phi_t)\right]\mathbf{u}^0(t), \mathbf{u}^0(t)\rangle \quad .$$

We use proposition 5.1. and definition 5.1. for proving that

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \;\geq\; K2(\phi_t, \eta_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)) \quad . \tag{21}$$

We propose now a Griffith type criterion of smooth fracture propagation.

A smooth crack propagation curve $t \mapsto \phi_t$ satisfies the generalized Griffith criterion if at any moment $t \geq 0$

$$K2(\phi_t, \eta_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)) \;\geq\; G\,\|\eta_t\|_\infty \mathcal{P}(\partial\phi_t(K))(supp\ \eta_t) \tag{22}$$

In our criterion of brittle fracture propagation $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is replaced by $K2(\phi_t, \eta_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t))$ and the variation of the area of the crack

$$\int_{\phi_t(K)} div_s \eta_t \ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$$

is replaced by $\|\eta_t\|_\infty \mathcal{P}(\partial\phi_t(K))(supp\ \eta)$. This criterion is therefore stronger than the classical Griffith criterion (this is a consequence of (21) and of the definition of the perimeter (15)). The two selection criterions are however equivalent if at any moment t the crack is smooth enough and it evolves in a very smooth manner.

The Irwin type criterion of brittle crack propagation is formulated in terms of concentration coefficients of the elastic energy.

Definition 5.2. *Let* $\mathbf{u}$ *be a special function with bounded variation. The lower (respectively upper) concentration coefficients of the elastic energy of* $\mathbf{u}$ *are*

$$C2^-(\mathbf{u}, x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \ \liminf_{r\to 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega\cap B(x,r)} w(\nabla\mathbf{u}) \ \mathrm{d}x}{r^{n-1}} \quad , \tag{23}$$

$$C2^+(\mathbf{u}, x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \ \limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega\cap B(x,r)} w(\nabla\mathbf{u}) \ \mathrm{d}x}{r^{n-1}} \quad . \tag{24}$$

If $x \in \Omega \setminus \mathbf{S_u}$ then $C2^+(\mathbf{u}, x) = 0$, because $w(\nabla\mathbf{u})$ has approximate limit in x.

Let us denote by $E\mathbf{u}$ the symmetric part of the distributional derivative of $\mathbf{u}$:

$$E\mathbf{u} \ = \ \frac{1}{2}\left(D\mathbf{u} \ + \ D^T\mathbf{u}\right) \quad .$$

$E\mathbf{u}$ can be seen, like $D\mathbf{u}$, as a vector measure; let $|\ E\mathbf{u}\ |$ be the scalar measure of the variation of $E\mathbf{u}$. For any borelian set $B \subset \Omega$

$$|\ E\mathbf{u}\ |\,(B) \ = \ sup\ \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\ E\mathbf{u}(A_i)\ | \ : \ \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \subset B \ , \ A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset \ \ \forall i \neq j \right\} \quad .$$

Let us consider the set $\Theta_\mathbf{u}$ introduced by Kohn [K]:

$$\Theta_\mathbf{u} = \left\{ x \in \Omega : \ \limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{|\ E\mathbf{u}\ |\,(B(x,r))}{r^{n-1}} \ > \ 0 \right\}$$

A result from [ACDM] ,concerning special functions with bounded deformations in the particular case of $\mathbf{u}$ special function with bounded variation, assures us that $\Theta_\mathbf{u}$ differs from $\mathbf{S_u}$ by a set which has $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ measure zero. We use the growth condition of w (3) in order to prove that if $x \in \Theta_\mathbf{u}$ then $C2^+(\mathbf{u}, x) =$

0. Therefore we have the following localization of the support of the energy concentration coefficients:

$$supp\ C2^-(\mathbf{u},\cdot)\ \subset\ supp\ C2^+(\mathbf{u},\cdot) \subset \mathbf{S_u} \setminus \Theta_{\mathbf{u}}\ \ .$$

One can prove, using the same proof, that if K is a crack set and $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,2}_K \cap L^\infty(\Omega, R^n)$ then

$$supp\ C2^-(\mathbf{u},\cdot)\ \subset\ supp\ C2^+(\mathbf{u},\cdot) \subset \partial K\ \ .$$

The Irwin type criterion that we propose is the following:

A smooth crack propagation curve $t \mapsto \phi_t$ satisfies the Irwin type criterion if at any moment $t \geq 0$ and for any $x \in\ \partial\phi_t(K)$

$$C2^+(\mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)), x)\ \geq\ G\ \ . \tag{25}$$

6 Energy concentration and crack propagation

The goal of this section is to find the connections between the Griffith criterion (22) and the Irwin criterion (25), using a measure-theoretic approach.

The first step is to associate a measure to the generalized Rice integral $K2$.

Definition 6.1. *Let us consider the linear functional*

$$k2\ :\ \mathbf{SBV}(\Omega, R^n) \cap L^\infty(\Omega, R^n)\ \times\ C_0^\infty(\Omega, R^n)\ \to R\ \ ,$$

$$k2(\mathbf{u}, \eta)\ =\ \int_\Omega \{\sigma(\nabla \mathbf{u})_{ij}\, \mathbf{u}_{i,k} \eta_{k,j}\ -\ w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ div\ \eta\}\ dx\ \ . \tag{26}$$

Then, for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{SBV}(\Omega, R^n) \cap L^\infty(\Omega, R^n)$ and for any open subset B of Ω we define

$$\mid K2 \mid (\mathbf{u})(B)\ =\ sup\,\{k2(\mathbf{u}, \eta)\ :\ supp\ \eta \subset\subset B\ ,\ \mid \eta \mid \leq 1\ ,\ \eta \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0\ on\ \mathbf{S_u}\}\ \ . \tag{27}$$

Since $\mid K2 \mid (\mathbf{u})(\cdot)$ is finitely additive, it gives raise to a positive measure, denoted by $\mid K2 \mid (\mathbf{u})$ too, named the generalized Rice integral as a measure.

It is easy to see that for a smooth crack propagation curve $t \mapsto \phi_t$ it is true that

$$\forall\, t \geq 0\ ,\ K2(\phi_t, \eta_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t))\ =\ k2(\mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)), \eta_t)\ \leq \mid K2 \mid (\mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)))(supp\ \eta_t)$$

Remark 6.1. The measures $\mathcal{P}(K)$ and $\mid K2 \mid (\mathbf{u})$ are constructed in the same way. The departure point was in both cases a linear functional over

$C_0^\infty(\Omega, R^n)$ — the area variation integral in the first case and the $k2$ integral in the second case. •

We shall define now the upper energy concentration coefficient as a measure.

Definition 6.2. *Let us consider* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{SBV}(\Omega, R^n)$. *For any* $r > 0$ *let* $B_r(\mathbf{u})$ *be a tubular neighborhood of* $\mathbf{S_u}$ *of radius* r. *For any open set* B *in* Ω *we define the upper energy concentration coefficient:*

$$CM^+(\mathbf{u})(B) = \limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{\int_{B_r(\mathbf{u})\cap B} w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ dx}{r} \quad . \tag{28}$$

Since $CM^+(\mathbf{u})(\cdot)$ *is an additive function, it give raise to a positive measure denoted by* $CM^+(\mathbf{u})$ *too, named the upper energy concentration coefficient as a measure.*

$CM^+(\mathbf{u})$ splits in two parts: the absolute continuous part with respect to $\mathcal{L}^n$ and the singular one.

$$CM^+(\mathbf{u}) \ = \ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^A \ + \ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^S \quad .$$

Let us consider, for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{SBV}(\Omega, R^n)$, the decomposition of $D\mathbf{u}$:

$$D\mathbf{u} \ = \ \nabla \mathbf{u}\ \mathrm{d}x \ + \ [\mathbf{u}] \otimes \mathbf{n}\ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_{\lfloor \mathbf{S_u}} \quad .$$

The measure $CM^+(\mathbf{u})^S$ can be decomposed in two parts — the absolute continuous part with respect to the measure

$$J(\mathbf{u}) \ = \ [\mathbf{u}] \otimes \mathbf{n}\ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_{\lfloor \mathbf{S_u}}$$

and the remaining singular part — i.e. :

$$CM^+(\mathbf{u})^S \ = \ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^J \ + \ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^C \quad .$$

It is easy to see that $CM^+(\mathbf{u})^A \ = \ 0$. We obtain therefore the following decomposition of $CM^+(\mathbf{u})$:

$$CM^+(\mathbf{u}) \ = \ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^J \ + \ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^C \tag{29}$$

If $\mathbf{u} \in W^{2,2}_{loc}(\Omega \backslash \mathbf{S_u}, R^n)$ and $\mathbf{S_u}$ is a crack set, then we find, by direct calculation, the expression of $CM^+(\mathbf{u})^C$:

$$CM^+(\mathbf{u})^C \ = \ C2^+(\mathbf{u}, x)\ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-2}_{\lfloor \partial \mathbf{S_u}} \quad . \tag{30}$$

The main result of the paper is the following:

Theorem 6.1. *Let K be a crack set and $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,2,\infty}_K(\mathbf{u}^0) \cap W^{2,2}_{loc}(\Omega \setminus K, R^n)$. Then $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0)$ if and only if for any open set $B \subset \Omega$*

$$| K2 | (\mathbf{u})(B) \ \leq \ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^C(B) \ . \tag{31}$$

A consequence of theorem 6.1. and (31) is that the Griffith criterion (22) is stronger than the Irwin type criterion (25). Indeed, let us consider a smooth crack propagation curve $t \mapsto \phi_t$ satisfying the generalized Griffith criterion (22). Then, at any moment $t \geq 0$, we have:

$$| K2 | (\mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)))(\Omega) \, \|\eta_t\|_\infty \ \geq \ K2(\phi_t, \eta_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)) \ \geq \ G \, \|\eta_t\|_\infty \mathcal{P}(\partial\phi_t(K))(supp\, \eta_t) \ .$$

This chain of inequalities, (31) and (30) imply the following relation:

$$\int_{\partial\phi_t(K)} C2^+(\mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)), \cdot) \ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \ \geq \ G \ \mathcal{P}(\partial\phi_t(K))(supp\ \eta_t) \ .$$

Therefore at any moment $t \geq 0$ there is at least an $x \in \partial\phi_t(K)$ such that

$$C2^+(\mathbf{u}(\phi_t, \mathbf{u}^0(t)), x) \ \geq G \ .$$

7 Proof of theorem 6.1.

1^{st} *implication.* We want to prove that if $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0)$ then for any open set B the relation (31) is true, namely

$$| K2 | (\mathbf{u})(B) \ \leq \ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^C(B) \ .$$

Let us consider a vector field η, such that:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \eta \in C^\infty_0(\Omega, R^n) & \\ | \eta | \leq 1 & \\ \eta \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \text{on } K \\ supp\ \eta \subset B & . \end{array} \tag{32}$$

Any such vector field η generates an one-parameter flow $s \mapsto \phi_s$. We can always find a curvilinear coordinate system $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_{n-1}, \gamma)$ such that on the edge of the crack set $\partial K \ \gamma = 0$, the surface $\gamma = s$ is the boundary of a tubular neighborhood of ∂K, namely

$$B_{r(s)}(\partial K) \ = \ \cup_{x \in \partial K} B_{r(s)}(x)$$

and for all $s > 0$

$$\phi_s(K) \subset \ K \cup B_{r(s)}(\partial K) \ . \tag{33}$$

We can suppose moreover that

$$\lim_{s \to 0} \frac{r(s)}{s} \ = \ 1$$

because (32) affirms that the crack $\phi_s(K)$ evolves with sub-unitary speed.

We denote by $\mathbf{u}_s$ the solution of the problem:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} div\ \sigma(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \ = \ 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \left(K \cup B_{r(s)}\right) \\ \sigma(\nabla \mathbf{u})\mathbf{n} \ = \ 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{r(s)}(\partial K) \\ \sigma(\nabla \mathbf{u})\mathbf{n} \ = \ 0 & \text{on (both sides of) } K \setminus B_{r(s)}(\partial K) \\ \mathbf{u} \ = \ \mathbf{u}^0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \ . \end{array}\right. \tag{34}$$

We consider, for any $s > 0$, the following stress field:

$$\sigma_s(x) \ = \ \left\{\begin{array}{ll} \sigma(\nabla \mathbf{u}_s)(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega \setminus \left(K \cup B_{r(s)}\right) \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere} \quad . \end{array}\right. \tag{35}$$

It is obvious that for any s σ_s is admissible with respect to $\phi_s(K)$ (definition 3.1.1). We use (8) and proposition 5.1. to deduce that

$$\liminf_{s\to 0} \frac{\int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u}_s)\ \mathrm{d}x \ - \ \int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{s} \ \leq \tag{36}$$

$$\leq \ \lim_{s\to 0} \frac{\int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u}(\phi_s, \mathbf{u}^0))\ \mathrm{d}x \ - \ \int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{s} \leq \ - \ K2(1_\Omega, \eta, \mathbf{u}^0) \quad .$$

Our goal is to prove that

$$\liminf_{s\to 0} \frac{\int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u}_s)\ \mathrm{d}x \ - \ \int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{s} \ = \ - \ \limsup_{s\to 0} \frac{\int_{B_{r(s)}\cap B} w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{r(s)} \quad . \tag{37}$$

For this it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega\setminus B_{r(s)}} w(\nabla \mathbf{u}_s)\ \mathrm{d}x \ - \ \int_{\Omega\setminus B_{r(s)}} w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{s} \ = \ 0 \quad . \tag{38}$$

Indeed, if (38) is true then an easy calculation shows that (37) is true. With this in mind we return to (36) and we see that

$$- \ \limsup_{s\to 0} \frac{\int_{B_{r(s)}\cap B} w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{r(s)} \ \leq \ -K2(1_\Omega, \eta, \mathbf{u}^0) \quad ,$$

hence

$$K2(1_\Omega, \eta, \mathbf{u}^0) \ \leq \ \limsup_{s\to 0} \frac{\int_{B_{r(s)}\cap B} w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{r(s)} \quad .$$

We take the supremum of the left side term of the last inequality, over all η satisfying (32), and we obtain the inequality

$$\mid K2 \mid (\mathbf{u})(B) \ \leq \ \limsup_{s\to 0} \frac{\int_{B_{r(s)}\cap B} w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{r(s)} \quad .$$

This inequality is equivalent with (31) (as it is shown by definition 5.2. and (30)).

Proof of (38). We consider for any s the function

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}(x) \;=\; \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}_s(x) & \text{if } x \notin B_{r(s)}(\partial K) \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in B_{r(s)}(\partial K) \end{cases} \quad .$$

Each $\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}$ is a special function with bounded variation on Ω.

In the following we shall proceed as in [BBC]. We denote by $\mathbf{e}_1, ..., \mathbf{e}_{n-1}, \mathbf{e}_\gamma$ the local basis associated to the previous mentioned system of coordinates. $\mathbf{e}^1, ..., \mathbf{e}^{n-1}, \mathbf{e}^\gamma$ represents the dual local basis. W can choose the system of coordinates such that $\mathbf{e}_\gamma = \; h \; \mathbf{n}$, where $\mathbf{n}$ is the normal of the surface $\gamma = ct.$ and h a scalar function.

The expression of the divergence of a tensor field in this system of coordinates is

$$div\ \sigma \;=\; \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_i}}\ \sigma\right) \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_i} \;+\; \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_\gamma}\ \sigma\right) \cdot \mathbf{e}_\gamma \quad .$$

We make the notation

$$div_\tau\ \sigma \;=\; \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_i}}\ \sigma\right) \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_i}$$

and we remark that in $div_\tau\ \sigma$ enters only partial derivatives with respect to α_i. The divergence of the field σ can be written as

$$div\ \sigma \;=\; div_\tau\ \sigma \;+ \frac{1}{h}\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma}\left(\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}\right) \;-\; \frac{1}{h}\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{n}}{\partial \gamma} \quad .$$

Consider $\sigma = \sigma(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ and

$$\sigma^m(\alpha_i, s) \;=\; \sigma_s(\alpha_i, s) \quad .$$

The field σ^m has the following interpretation: imagine that at the "moment" s the curvilinear cylinder $B_{r(s)}(\partial K)$ is removed from the elastic body Ω. Then $\sigma^m(\cdot, s)$ represents the superficial stress of the remaining body on the new-created surface, i.e. $\partial B_{r(s)}(\partial K)$. Therefore

$$\sigma^m(\alpha_i, a)\mathbf{n} \;=\; 0 \quad ,$$

where $\mathbf{n}$ is the normal of the surface $\gamma = a$.

We consider, for any s the auxiliary elastic problem:

$$\begin{cases} div\ \sigma_s^{aux} \;=\; 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \left(K \cup B_{r(s)}(\partial K)\right) \\ \sigma_s^{aux}\mathbf{n} \;=\; \sigma(\alpha_i, s)\mathbf{n} & \text{on } \left(K \setminus B_{r(s)}(\partial K)\right) \cup \partial B_{r(s)}(\partial K) \\ \mathbf{u}_s^{aux} \;=\; 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

with the solution $\mathbf{u}_s^{aux}(\alpha_i, \gamma)$, $\gamma \leq s$. The associated stress field is $\sigma_s^{aux}(\alpha_i, \gamma)$. The superposition principle applied to the elastic problem (9) with the solution $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0)$, (34) and (39) leads us to the equality

$$\sigma(\alpha_i, s) \;=\; \sigma^m(\alpha_i, s) + \sigma_s^{aux}(\alpha_i, s) \quad . \tag{40}$$

The following equality is obtained from a linear combination of the divergence equations contained in the problems (9), (34) and (39) , written in curvilinear coordinates, together with (40).

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma}\left(\sigma\mathbf{n}\right)(\alpha_i, \gamma = s) \;=\; \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma}\left(\sigma_s^{aux}\mathbf{n}\right)(\alpha_i, \gamma = s) \;-\; h\ div\ \sigma^m(\alpha_i, \gamma = s) \quad . \tag{41}$$

We make the derivative with respect to s in the equality (40), then we multiply by $\mathbf{n}$ and we obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma}\left(\sigma\mathbf{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i,\gamma=s\right) \;=\; \frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma'}_{|_{\gamma'=s}}\left(\sigma^{aux}_{\gamma'}\mathbf{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i,\gamma=s\right) \;+\; \frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma}\left(\sigma^{aux}_{s}\mathbf{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i,\gamma=s\right) . \tag{42}$$

(41) and (42) lead us to the equality

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma'}_{|_{\gamma'=s}}\left(\sigma^{aux}_{\gamma'}\mathbf{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i,\gamma=s\right) \;=\; -\,h\;div\;\sigma^m(\alpha_i,\gamma=s) \quad . \tag{43}$$

We keep now s constant. Let us consider $s'\in[0,s]$. We use the notation

$$\Omega_{s'}=\Omega\setminus\left(K\cup B_{r(s')}(\partial K)\right) \quad ,$$

$$S_{s'}=\partial B_{r(s')}(\partial K) \quad .$$

It is obvious that if $s'<s"$ then $\Omega_{s"}\subset\Omega_{s'}$.

The field $\sigma^{aux}_{s'}$ is by definition the elastic stress field in the body $\Omega_{s'}$, with the imposed displacement on it's exterior boundary $\partial\Omega$ equal to 0 and subjected to the loads $\sigma(\alpha_i,r(s'))\mathbf{n}(\alpha_i,s')$ on it's interior boundary $S_{s'}$. It is straightforward that the same field represents the elastic stress in the body Ω_s, with the imposed displacement on it's exterior boundary $\partial\Omega$ equal to 0 and subjected to the loads $\sigma^{aux}_{s'}(\alpha_i,s)\mathbf{n}(\alpha_i,s)$ on S_s. Therefore, by derivation with respect to s', we can prove that $\partial/\partial\gamma'_{|_{\gamma'=s}}\left(\sigma^{aux}_{s'}\right)$ is the elastic stress field in Ω_s, resulting from the imposed displacement 0 on $\partial\Omega$ and the loads $\partial/\partial\gamma'_{|_{\gamma'=s}}\left(\sigma^{aux}_{s'}\mathbf{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i,s\right)$ applied on S_s. The equation (43) shows that these loads are equal to $-\,h\;div\;\sigma^m(\alpha_i,s)$.

By our choice of the coordinate system we have the equality $h \;=\; \partial\, r(s)/\partial s$. For our purposes it is not restrictive to assume that when s tends to 0 $\mathbf{u}_s$ tends to $\mathbf{u}$ and $\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_s)$ tends to $\varepsilon(\mathbf{u})$. Indeed, there is a positive constant M such that for all $s\leq 1$

$$c\int_\Omega \mid\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}\mid^2\;\mathrm{d}x+\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}}) \;\leq\; \int_\Omega w(\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}))\;\mathrm{d}x+\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}}) \;\leq\; M$$

where c is the ellipticity constant of the tensor $\mathbf{C}$. The last inequality is true because for all s the elastic energy of $\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}$ is smaller that the elastic energy of $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}}\subset\; K\cup\partial B_{r(s)}(\partial K)$. By the compactness theorem of Bellettini, Coscia & Dal Maso [BCDM] and the regularity of $\tilde{\mathbf{u}_s}$, there exists a sequence $s_h\to 0$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}_{s_h}}$ converges punctually to $\mathbf{u}$ and $\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{u}_{s_h}})$ converges punctually to $\varepsilon(\mathbf{u})$.

Therefore when s tends to 0 $\sigma^m(\alpha_i,s)=\sigma_s(\alpha_i,s)$ tends to $\sigma(\alpha_i,s)$, hence $div\;\sigma^m$ tends to 0 (because $div\;\sigma=0$). The conclusion is that $-\,h\;div\;\sigma^m(\alpha_i,s)$ tends to 0 too, so the displacement solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} div\;\sigma(\nabla\mathbf{v}) \;=\; 0 & \text{in } \Omega_s \\ \mathbf{v} \;=\; 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{v})\mathbf{n} \;=\; 0 & \text{on (both sides of) } K\cap\Omega_s \\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{v})\mathbf{n} \;=\; -\,h\;div\;\sigma^m(\alpha_i,s) & \text{on } \mathbf{S}_s \quad , \end{cases}$$

which is $\partial/\partial\gamma'_{|_{\gamma'=s}}(\mathbf{u}^{aux}_{s'})$, tends to 0. In particular

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{\mathbf{u}_s\ -\ \mathbf{u}}{s}\ =\ -\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma'}_{|_{\gamma'=0}}\mathbf{u}^{aux}_{\gamma'}\ =\ 0\ . \tag{44}$$

We remark that

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{\int_{\Omega\setminus B_{r(s)}}w(\nabla\mathbf{u}_s)\ \mathrm{d}x\ -\ \int_{\Omega\setminus B_{r(s)}}w(\nabla\mathbf{u})\ \mathrm{d}x}{s}\ =\ \frac{1}{2}\lim_{s\to 0}\int_{S_s}(\sigma\mathbf{n})\cdot\frac{\mathbf{u}\ -\ \mathbf{u}_s}{s}\ \mathrm{x}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\ .$$

This equality together with (44) concludes the proof of (38) •

2^{nd} *implication.* We want to prove now that if

$$\mathbf{u}\in W^{1,2,\infty}_K(\mathbf{u}^0)\cap W^{2,2}_{loc}(\Omega\setminus K,R^n)$$

and for any open set $B\subset\Omega$

$$\mid K2\mid(\mathbf{u})(B)\ \le\ CM^+(\mathbf{u})^C(B)\ \ ,$$

then $\mathbf{u}\ =\ \mathbf{u}(K,\mathbf{u}^0)$.

The regularity assumptions concerning $\mathbf{u}$ and K allow us to make the further calculations. As previously, we use the notations: $\sigma=\sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u})$, $w\ =\ w(\nabla\mathbf{u})$.

Let us consider a vector field η satisfying (32). Then

$$k2(\mathbf{u},\eta)\ =\ \sigma_{ij}\mathbf{u}_{i,k}\eta_{k,j}-w\,div\,\eta\ \mathrm{d}x\ =\ \int_\Omega -\sigma_{li,i}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\ \eta_k-[w\ \eta_i\ -\ \sigma_{lj}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\eta_k]_{,i}\ \mathrm{d}x\ .$$

We deduce that the absolute continuous part of the measure $\mid K2\mid(\mathbf{u})$ has the density $\mid\sigma_{li,i}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\mid$. The hypothesis (31) and the decomposition (29) imply that this density is equal to 0, hence:

$$div\ \sigma(\nabla\mathbf{u})\ =\ 0\quad\text{ a.e. in }\Omega\ .$$

Therefore σ is an admissible stress in the sense of the definition 3.1.1. . The before mentioned result of Del Piero [DP] implies that $\sigma\mathbf{n}$ has no jumps over K.

The measure $\mid K2\mid$ has a part concentrated on K, i.e. the absolute continuous part of $\mid K2\mid$ with respect to the measure $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_{|_K}$. The density of this part can be calculated from the expression of $k2$:

$$k2(\mathbf{u},\eta)\ =\ \int_\Omega -\ [w\ \eta_i\ -\ \sigma_{lj}\mathbf{u}_{l,k}\eta_k]_{,i}\ \mathrm{d}x$$

Indeed, (32) and the regularity assumptions over K and $\mathbf{u}$ allow us to use a flux-divergence formula in order to prove that the density of this part of $\mid K2\mid$ is $\mid\sigma\mathbf{n}\mid$. Again, (31) and the decomposition (29) imply that this density is equal to 0, hence:

$$\sigma\mathbf{n}\ =\ 0\qquad\text{on (both sides of) }K$$

This concludes the proof. •

8 Final considerations

Let us return to relation (36) from the proof of theorem 6.1., first implication. We have considered there $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0)$ and η an arbitrary vector field, such that

$$\begin{array}{l} \eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, R^n) \\ \mid \eta \mid \leq 1 \\ \eta \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \qquad\qquad \text{on } K \quad . \end{array} \tag{45}$$

This field generates the one-parameter flow ϕ_s, which represents an arbitrary smooth crack propagation curve with sub-unitary initial velocity η. The energy release rate, defined by (17), associated to this curve, at the moment $s = 0$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{E}(\eta)$. It has the expression:

$$\mathcal{E}(\eta) \;=\; -\lim_{s \to 0} \frac{\int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u}(\phi_s, \mathbf{u}^0))\, \mathrm{d}x \;-\; \int_\Omega w(\nabla \mathbf{u})\, \mathrm{d}x}{s} \quad .$$

With this notation the relation (36) becomes:

$$-\mathcal{E}(\eta) \;\leq\; -K2(1_\Omega, \eta, \mathbf{u}^0) \quad .$$

In fact we have proved more, namely that

$$-CM^+(\mathbf{u})^C(\Omega) \;\leq\; -\mathcal{E}(\eta) \;\leq\; -K2(1_\Omega, \eta, \mathbf{u}^0) \quad .$$

Therefore we have the following relation:

$$\mid K2 \mid (\mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0))(\Omega) \;\leq\; \sup\{\mathcal{E}(\eta) : \eta \text{ satisfies (45)}\} \;\leq\; CM^+(\mathbf{u}(K, \mathbf{u}^0))^C(\Omega) \quad . \tag{46}$$

This means that the supremum of the initial energy release rate, taken over all possible smooth propagations of the initial crack K with sub-unitary speed, is bounded by the concentration coefficients $\mid K2 \mid$ and CM^+, calculated for the displacement of the body with the initial crack K.

The assumption that Griffith and Irwin criterions of brittle crack propagation are equivalent is usual in classical fracture mechanics. From our considerations it is straightforward that this assumption means that at any moment the coefficients $\mid K2 \mid$ and CM^+ are equal, which leads to the following physical statement: during the evolution, the crack takes energy from the body with maximal speed. We leave for further examinations whether this statement can be generally proved or it has to be supposed.

August 1, 1997

Marius Buliga
Institute of Mathematics
of the Romanian Academy

References

[A1] L. Ambrosio, Variational problems in SBV and image segmentation, *Acta Appl. Mathematicæ*, **17** (1989), 1-40

[A2] L. Ambrosio, Existence theory for a new class of variational problems, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **111** (1990), 291-322

[ABF] L. Ambrosio, G. Buttazzo, I. Fonseca, Lower semicontinuity problems in Sobolev spaces with respect to a measure, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **75** (1996), 211-224

[ACDM] L. Ambrosio, A. Coscia, G. Dal Maso, Fine properties of functions in **BD**, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **139** (1997), 201-238

[Ba] J.M. Ball, Nonlinear elasticity and materials science: A survey of some recent developments. in: *Nonlinear Mathematics and Its Applications*, P.J. Aston (ed.), Cambridge University Press (1996), 93-119

[BBC] P. Ballard, M. Buliga, A. Constantinescu, Reconstruction d'un champ de contraintes résiduelles à partir des contraintes mesurées sur des surfaces successives. Existence et unicité. (Inversion of residual stresses from surface stress measurements. Existence and uniqueness), *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris*, Sér. II **319**(10) (1994), 1117-1122

[BCDM] G. Bellettini, A. Coscia, G. Dal Maso, Compactness and lower semicontinuity properties in $\mathbf{SBD}(\Omega)$, *Math. Z.*, **228** (1998), 337-351

[Bu] M. Buliga, *Variational Formulations in Brittle Fracture Mechanics*, PhD Thesis, Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy (1997)

[C] A.P. Calderón, On an inverse boundary value problem. *Seminar on Numerical Analysis and its Applications to Continuum Physics*, Rio de Janeiro (1980), Soc. Brasil. Mat., 65-73

[CZ] A.P. Calderón, A. Zygmund, On the differentiability of functions which are of bounded variation in Tonelli's sense, *Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina*, **20** (1960), 102-121

[DGA] E. De Giorgi, L. Ambrosio, Un nuovo funzionale del calcolo delle variazioni, *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur.*, **82** (1988), 199-210

[DGCL] E. De Giorgi, G. Carriero, A. Leaci, Existence theory for a mimimum problem with free discontinuity set, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **108** (1989), 195-218

[DP] . Del Piero, Recent developments in the mechanics of materials which do not support tension, in: *Free Boundary Problems: Theory and Applications*, vol. I, K.H. Hoffmann, J. Sprekels (eds.), Pitman Res. Notes in Math. Series, Longman Scientific & Technical, (1990)

[EbM] D.G. Ebin, J. Marsden, Groups of diffeomorphisms and the notion of an incompressible fluid, *Ann. of Math.*, **92**(2) (1970), 102-163

[Es] J.D. Eshelby, Energy relations and the energy-momentum tensor in continuum mechanics. in: *Inelastic Behavior of Solids*, M.F. Kanninen et al. (eds.), McGraw-Hill New York (1970), 77-115

[G] A.A. Griffih, The phenomenon of rupture and flow in solids, *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London A*, bf 221 (1920), 163-198

[Gu1] M.E. Gurtin, On the energy release rate in quasistatic elastic crack propagation, *J. Elasticity*, **9**(2) (1979), 187-195

[Gu2] M.E. Gurtin, Thermodynamics and the Griffith criterion for brittle fracture, *Int. J. Solids Structures*,**15** (1979), 553-560

[I] G. R. Irwin, *Structural Mechanics*, Pergamon Press, London, England (1960)

[M] J.J. Moreau, Fonctionnelles convexes, *Séminaire sur les Equations aux Derivées Partielles*, College de France 1966-1967

[MS] D. Mumford, J. Shah, Optimal approximation by piecewise smooth functions and associated variational problems, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **42**(5) (1989), 577-685

[Oht1] K. Ohtsuka, Generalized J-integral and its applications I. Basic theory, *Japan J. Appl. Math.*, **2** (1985), 21-52

[Oht2] K. Ohtsuka, Generalized J-integral and three-dimensional fracture mechanics I, *Hiroshima Math. J.*, **11** (1981), 329-350

[Oht3] K. Ohtsuka, Generalized J-integral and three-dimensional fracture mechanics II, *Hiroshima Math. J.*, **16** (1986), 327-352

[Oht4] K. Ohtsuka, Generalized J-integral and its applications, *RIMS Kokyuroku A*, **62**, 149-165

[R] J.R. Rice, Mathematical analysis in the mechanics of fracture, in:*Fracture: An Advanced Treatise*, vol II, H. Liebowitz (ed.), Academic Press New York (1969), 191-311

[SU1] J. Sylvester, G. Uhlmann, A global uniqueness theorem for an inverse boundary value problem, *Ann. of Math.*, **125**(1) (1987), 153-169

[SU2] J. Sylvester, G. Uhlmann, The Dirichlet to Neumann map and applications. in: Inverse problems in partial differential equations (Arcota, CA, 1989), *SIAM*, Philadelphia, PA, (1990)

[StLe] H. Stumpf, K.Ch. Le, Variational principles of nonlinear fracture mechanics, *Acta Mechanica*, **83** (1990), 25-37